

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 2, 4-15, 17-19, 30-34, 37 and 38 are currently pending.
- Claim 1 is amended herein.
- New claim 39 is added herein.

[0003] Furthermore, new claim 39 is fully supported by the Application, and therefore does not constitute new matter. Support for this new claim is found in the specification at least at page 38, lines 27-32 and page 39, lines 1-4.

[0004] New claim 39 is allowable over the cited document of record at least for the reasons given below.

Allowed Claims

[0005] The decision of the Board of Appeals and Interferences mailed on January 15, 2010 reversed the rejections for claims 11-15, 17-19, 30-34, and 38. Accordingly, these claims now stand allowable over the cited document. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowability of these claims and, pending resolution of the other currently pending claims, issue a Notice of Allowance.

Claims 37 and 38 Comply With § 112 1st Paragraph

[0006] Applicant respectfully notes that the 112, 1st paragraph rejection of claims 37 and 38 has been reversed by the Examiner, thus obviating the rejection.

Cited Document

[0007] Kougiouris (2004/0039993) has been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application.

Kougiouris Fails to Anticipate Claims 1, 2, 4-15, 17-19, 30-34, 37 and 38

[0008] In the last Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-15, 17-19, 30-34, 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kougiouris. This rejection was appealed, and the rejections of claims 11-15, 17-19, 30-34, and 38 were reversed. As noted above, those claims stand allowable over Kougiouris. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 37 remain rejected as being anticipated by Kougiouris.

[0009] In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. Applicant believes that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over Kougiouris. In Kougiouris, no set of attributes is *automatically* identified. Rather, the attributes – which are included in the markup file – are manually specified by the developer when the developer codes the markup file. Kougiouris makes no mention of automatically identifying the fields in the markup file. In fact, the only “automatic” operation in Kougiouris is the validation of user input. Because such validation can only occur after fields are identified and code for forms is created, this automatic operation does not disclose the “automatic” identifying claimed by claim 1.

[0010] Claims 2, 4-10, and 37, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

New Claim 39

[0011] New claim 39 recites that the creating “code for the one or more forms” is performed “automatically” based on “the automatic identifying of the set of the one or more attributes.” In contrast, Kougiouris makes no mention of the markup file – which includes the code for the forms in Kougiouris – being generated automatically or based on any sort of automatic identification of a set of attributes. Accordingly, at least for this reason, claim 39 is allowable over Kougiouris.

Conclusion

[0012] If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application,
Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/

Dated: March 15, 2010

Robert C. Peck
(rbp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826